

Agencies Appropriations Act. According to the DEA, 33.3 kilograms of methamphetamine were seized in my home State of Nebraska in 2006. For this reason, I would like to commend the leadership and Appropriations Committee for including \$85 million in funding for grant projects to address the manufacture, sale and use of methamphetamine. However, we must send a stronger message to those who are smuggling and distributing the drug, which is why I have introduced the Methamphetamine Kingpin Elimination Act of 2007.

The number of methamphetamine labs in the U.S. has declined since Congress enacted the Combat Methamphetamine Epidemic Act last year to restrict the sale of pseudoephedrine, the key ingredient in methamphetamine. Unfortunately, a reverse trend has occurred south of our border.

Mexico is the largest foreign supplier of methamphetamine destined for the U.S. It is estimated that as much as 80 percent of the methamphetamine on U.S. streets comes from Mexico. Unlike the small U.S. kitchen labs, Mexican drug cartels are creating superlabs, which produce huge quantities of cheap methamphetamine and then smuggle it north to U.S. users.

Mr. Speaker, it is time we stop this flood of methamphetamine coming across our border.

The "Meth Kingpin Elimination Act of 2007," increases penalties for meth kingpins. The bill also authorizes \$20 million for multi-jurisdictional methamphetamine task forces.

Meth devastates not only those who abuse the drug, but their families and their communities as well. The drug has a phenomenal rate of addiction, with some experts saying users often get hooked after just one use. Recent studies have demonstrated that methamphetamine causes more damage to the brain than heroin, alcohol, or cocaine.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you to join me in keeping this destructive drug off America's streets and ensuring that meth kingpins and traffickers receive harsher penalties.

Mr. Speaker, we must work together to address this severe problem.

COMMERCE, JUSTICE, SCIENCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 562 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 3093.

□ 1032

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3093) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, and Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes, with Mr. SNYDER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, July 25, 2007, the amendment by the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHAY) had been disposed of and the bill had been read through page 85, line 24.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. STEARNS

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Mr. STEARNS: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

TITLE VII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 701. None of the funds made available in this Act to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission may be used for litigation expenses incurred in connection with cases commenced after the date of the enactment of this Act against employers on the grounds that such employers require employees to speak English.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, as mentioned, the EEOC, which is the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, has accused the Salvation Army of allegedly discriminating against two of their employees in a Boston area thrift store for requiring them to speak English on the job.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment would prevent the EEOC from using any appropriated funds to initiate a civil action or file a motion in any courts on the grounds that the organization, in this case the Salvation Army, requires an employee to speak English while engaged in work.

The question I have is, how do you discriminate against a person who speaks English on the job? This amendment was prompted by this lawsuit filed in April by the EEOC against the Salvation Army, which has helped thousands of people in countries all over the world. Can't you hire people today who speak English? The two employees were given 1 year to learn English in order to speak the language you and I are speaking in the House today and the language spoken by our coworkers; however, these folks failed to try to learn even some basic English and were fired.

Even though the Salvation Army clearly posted the rule and gave the two employees a year to learn English, the EEOC lawyers filed a lawsuit seeking hundreds of thousands of dollars in monetary damages to compensate the employees for "the emotional pain, suffering and inconvenience" they suffered by being asked to speak English to the best of their ability while on the job.

In 2003, a Federal judge in Boston upheld the Salvation Army's policy requiring workers to speak English while on the job. However, the EEOC did not like this ruling, so they are continuing to harass the Salvation Army.

Now, the Salvation Army, as we all know, is a Christian evangelical organization whose sole mission is to help the downtrodden, the blind, the sick

and anyone else in need. Their personnel standing on cold street corners during Christmastime is something to behold, ringing a bell on behalf of the poor. They collect and sell donated clothes and household items in their thrift stores to raise money for the poor, operate soup kitchens, and hire people that no one else will.

Since 1865, this organization has lived by Christ's teaching that as we do unto the least of our people, we do unto the Lord. Now this organization is in trouble for insisting its employees learn to speak English in order to better serve these lofty goals. Remember, the Salvation Army was trying to help their employees by encouraging them to simply learn the English language.

EEOC has crossed the line in its overzealous pursuit of companies that require English in the workplace. Only Congress can bring this organization back to its intended mission. If we don't, the continued proliferation of English-related lawsuits will cause employers facing close hiring decisions to hire defensively, to the detriment of new immigrants with marginal English proficiency. While the children of immigrants typically learn English in our school system, adult immigrants are most likely to learn or improve language skills for work-related reasons often through programs that are simply hosted by the employers themselves.

This arrangement is ordinarily a win-win situation. The immigrant is encouraged to gain a full knowledge skill that improves his work efforts and civic engagement, and the employer benefits from having employees that can communicate with one another. So the EEOC's policy takes a mutually beneficial situation and injects the constant fear of litigation on employers. Most importantly, since the EEOC's funds are fungible, every dollar it uses to pursue these cases is a dollar not being spent on pursuing the kind of discrimination that the EEOC was originally created to combat.

These are our tax dollars, my colleagues, yours and mine, paying the salaries of the EEOC lawyers, who file endless lawsuits, while the Salvation Army must use its own funds, funds that would be better used helping the poor, instead of hiring more attorneys to fight these kinds of cases in court. The EEOC should instead focus its limited resources on the current backlog of 54,265 complaints, instead of wasting time and taxpayer money on policies that serve to achieve unity in our country.

I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment and help protect the charities like the Salvation Army.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I think everybody ought to speak English in this country, and I think we ought to have